

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,104	01/23/2006	Henry Daniell	10669-040	6977
79229 7590 05/13/2010 Timothy H. Van Dyke 390 No. Orange Avenue			EXAMINER	
			KUBELIK, ANNE R	
Suite 2500 Orlando, FL 3	2801		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1638	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/520,104	DANIELL, HENRY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Anne R. Kubelik	1638	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

- 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

- 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
 - appeal: and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
 - NOTE: New issues: The amendments to the specification to correct priority cannot be entered. Such a correction must be petitioned. See MPEP 201.11 and 37 CFR 1.78. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
- 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) X will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 - The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 - Claim(s) allowed:
 - Claim(s) objected to:
 - Claim(s) rejected: 1-6, 13-25, 33-49, 51.
 - Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. ☐ Other:

/Anne R Kubelik/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

112 2nd.

Applicant urges that the sequence identifer is not necessary because the sequence of IFNa2b is well known, as Reichert et al was used in the prior Office action. This is not found persuasive because more than one protein is called IFNa2b (see Reichert et al, US 5,460,956, column 2, lines 43-47).

Applicant urges that the recitation of a transcriptionally active spacer overcomes McBride in view of Reichert. This is not found persuasive because the claims would be rejected over McBride in view of Reichert and further in view of Daniell.

Applicant urges that McBride does not enable interferon expression in chloroplasts. This is not found persuasive because this is why Reichert was cited - Reichert teaches an interferon sequence. Using the teachings of the cited art, one of skill in the art could construct a chloroplast transformation vector encoding this interferon and transform chloroplasts with the vector. As Applicant did not have to do anything special to get interferon to be successfully expressed in plastids, and as McBride and Daniell expected that human pharmaceutical proteins could be successfully so expressed, one of skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant urges that Daniell cannot be abuilded as prior at hecause of the correction of priority. This is not found persuasive because a

correction of priority must be petitioned, as discussed above.

Applicant urges that the amendments to claim 1 obviate the rejection over McBride in view of Reichert and further in view of Maliga or Chandrasequan or Conkling and Avocok or Rathinasabapathi. This is not found persuasive because the rejections would simply be

modified to include Daniell.